



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1459
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/193,684 | 06/29/2001 | Katsumi Abe | 21038SUSD | 9431 |
| 21890 7990 02/25/2004 | | | | |
| OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. | | | | |
| 1940 DUKE STREET | | | | |
| ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314 | | | | |
| EXAMINER | | | | |
| KOPEC, MARK T | | | | |
| ART UNIT | | | | |
| PAPER NUMBER | | | | |
| 1751 | | | | |
| DATE MAILED: 02/25/2004 | | | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

| | |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Application No. 09/893,684 | Applicant(s) ABE ET AL. |
| Examiner Mark Kopec | Art Unit 1751 |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(c).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 5, 6, 9 and 10 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 2 and 12 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 11, 13-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of.
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-945) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: ____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date: ____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____ |

This action is responsive to applicant's amendment/response filed 11/19/03. Claims 1-20 are currently pending with claims 5, 6, 9 and 10 withdrawn from consideration.

Applicant's election of Group I (claims 1-8) in Paper No. (response filed 11/19/03) is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 11, 13-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 11-76763, JP 11-84694 or JP 7-56365.

This rejection is maintained for the reasons set forth at pages 6-8 of the Rejection mailed 8/19/03 (Paper #6).

Applicant's arguments filed 11/19/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's discussion of the prior art and the claimed temperature range of "65°C to 200°C" is noted (pages 6-7 of the response filed 11/19/03). Applicant's remarks can be summarized:

Art Unit: 1751

The Applicants' data in Tables 1-1 and 1-2 on pages 36 and 39 of the specification show the benefits of selecting a treatment temperature within the range 65°C to 200°C, e.g., that the photoconductors prepared with the charge-transporting material produced by the claimed method have improved sensitivity and less residual potential.

The examiner has carefully reviewed the data presented throughout the instant specification. Tables 1-1 and 1-2 disclose 23 examples/comparative examples. Various charge transport materials and heating temperatures are utilized in these examples.

Instant claims 2 and 12 are allowed as the presented data is commensurate in scope with the temperature range recited in these claims (80° to 130°). Specifically, it appears 22 of the examples/comparative examples are within this range (and disclose several species of charge transport materials).

With respect to the remaining claims (65°C to 200°C), the instant showing is insufficient to overcome the rejections of record.

It is the examiner's position that the disclosed showing is not commensurate in scope with the claimed range. Specifically, no comparison exists in the temperature range above 130°C, and only examples 19 and 20 are below 80°C (65°C). Whether the unexpected results are the result of unexpectedly improved results or a property not taught by the prior art, the "objective evidence of nonobviousness must be commensurate in

scope with the claims which the evidence is offered to support." In other words, the showing of unexpected results must be reviewed to see if the results occur over the entire claimed range. In re Clemens, 622 F.2d 1029, 1036, 206 USPQ 289, 296 (CCPA 1980). To establish unexpected results over a claimed range, applicants should compare a sufficient number of tests both inside and outside the claimed range to show the criticality of the claimed range. In re Hill, 284 F.2d 955, 128 USPQ 197 (CCPA 1960). In the instant case, applicant has not provided a commensurate showing with respect to the temperature range from 65°C to 80°C.

Additionally, examples 19 and 20 (65°C) do not provide a comparison with the closest prior art. As acknowledged by applicant, the prior art specifically disclose/exemplifies heating temperatures of 60°C. Instant examples/comparative examples 19-20 draw a comparison to 45°C. A direct comparison to 60°C is necessary to overcome any obviousness rejection.

An affidavit or declaration under 37 CFR 1.132 must compare the claimed subject matter with the closest prior art to be effective to rebut a prima facie case of obviousness. In re Burckel, 592 F.2d 1175, 201 USPQ 67 (CCPA 1979). "A comparison of the claimed invention with the disclosure of each cited reference to determine the number of claim limitations in common

with each reference, bearing in mind the relative importance of particular limitations, will usually yield the closest single prior art reference." In re Merchant, 575 F.2d 865, 868, 197 USPQ 785, 787 (CCPA 1978) (emphasis in original). Where the comparison is not identical with the reference disclosure, deviations therefrom should be explained, In re Finley, 174 F.2d 130, 81 USPQ 383 (CCPA 1949), and if not explained should be noted and evaluated, and if significant, explanation should be required. In re Armstrong, 280 F.2d 132, 126 USPQ 281 (CCPA 1960) (deviations from example were inconsequential).

In view of the foregoing, the above claims have failed to patentably distinguish over the applied art.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark Kopec whose telephone number is (571) 272-1319. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 9:30 AM to 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dr. Yogendra Gupta can be reached on (571) 272-1316. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Mark Kopec
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1751

MK
February 17, 2004